

Exhibit B

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
3

4 In Re: Bard IVC Filters) MD-15-02641-PHX-DGC
5 Products Liability Litigation)
6)
7) Phoenix, Arizona
8) August 23, 2016
9)
10)
11)
12)
13)
14)
15)
16)
17)
18)
19)
20)

21 BEFORE: THE HONORABLE DAVID G. CAMPBELL, JUDGE

22 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

23 FIFTH SCHEDULING CONFERENCE
24

25 Official Court Reporter:
Patricia Lyons, RMR, CRR
Sandra Day O'Connor U.S. Courthouse, Ste. 312
401 West Washington Street, SPC 41
Phoenix, Arizona 85003-2150
(602) 322-7257

Proceedings Reported by Stenographic Court Reporter
Transcript Prepared with Computer-Aided Transcription

12:32:00 1 in one of those cases saying if they didn't dismiss one of
2 those cases and work out this conflict, I intended to raise it
3 with the Court. I'm happy to report half of them have since
4 been dismissed. So there are only three of those cases
12:32:15 5 pending. But there are separate lawyers representing the
6 plaintiff in each case for those three plaintiffs.

7 THE COURT: Okay. What I want to do with those three
8 is this: I would like to direct the plaintiffs steering
9 committee to have a conversation with the lawyers in those
12:32:27 10 three cases.

11 Obviously, it has to be resolved one way or the
12 other. We can't go forward with two cases represented by two
13 different lawyers. And consolidation isn't the answer, in my
14 view, because then you've still got two lawyers purporting to
12:32:42 15 each represent the plaintiff. Unless they want to team up and
16 jointly represent them in a single case, in which event just
17 dismiss one and have the lawyer appear in the other. But I
18 don't think we ought to continue on with two cases with two
19 different lawyers.

12:32:56 20 So let's have somebody on the plaintiffs steering
21 committee designated to talk to those three and I'll ask you
22 to give a status report in mid October as to what's happened
23 with them. And if we have a situation where two plaintiffs
24 lawyers won't agree, then I'll allow a motion to be filed and
12:33:09 25 I'll decide what ought to happen with those.

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
3

4 In Re: Bard IVC Filters) MD-15-02641-PHX-DGC
5 Products Liability Litigation)
6) Phoenix, Arizona
7) December 9, 2016
8)
9
10

11 BEFORE: THE HONORABLE DAVID G. CAMPBELL, JUDGE

12 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

13 SEVENTH SCHEDULING CONFERENCE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Official Court Reporter:
22 Patricia Lyons, RMR, CRR
23 Sandra Day O'Connor U.S. Courthouse, Ste. 312
24 401 West Washington Street, SPC 41
25 Phoenix, Arizona 85003-2150
(602) 322-7257

Proceedings Reported by Stenographic Court Reporter
Transcript Prepared with Computer-Aided Transcription

16:16:33 1 to file an amended short-form complaint. This concerns
2 Florence Edwards, who is deceased. The case apparently was
3 initially brought by her husband. They want to amend to
4 substitute her sister-in-law as the plaintiff in the
16:17:03 5 short-form complaint. Is there any objection to that?

6 MR. NORTH: That's not the one where another
7 deceased person filed a complaint, is it? There's one like
8 that somewhere.

9 THE COURT: No. This is one where apparently -- I'm
16:17:20 10 sorry. It wasn't -- it wasn't the deceased's husband, it was
11 the deceased's son who was plaintiff and he wants to
12 substitute the deceased's daughter as a plaintiff.

13 MR. NORTH: No objection to that, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Okay. That's at Docket 4136. We'll
16:17:36 15 grant that.

16 The striking of the complaint is at Docket 4137.
17 We'll grant that.

18 There's a motion to dismiss that was filed by
19 defendants back on November 14th and this concerns an
16:17:54 20 individual named Aron Aldridge who was deceased at the time
21 the complaint was filed. The motion indicates there have been
22 several letters written, e-mails sent, both to the counsel for
23 this plaintiff but also to plaintiff steering committee
24 counsel, without response, so they filed a motion to dismiss
16:18:17 25 and it's now over time with no response. It's been on file

16:18:21 1 for almost a month.

2 Apparently David Matthews is shown as the plaintiff's
3 attorney.

4 I'm inclined to just grant the motion because it's
16:18:34 5 long overdue and there doesn't appear to be any dispute the
6 fellow was deceased when it was filed, but I am concerned
7 about what appears to be lack of response, both from
8 Mr. Matthews and from PSC members who letters and e-mails were
9 addressed to, and the motion says we couldn't get a response
16:18:51 10 as to what was going to happen.

11 MR. LOPEZ: I'm equally concerned. I know
12 Mr. Matthews well, so I'll certainly look into that, Your
13 Honor. Figure out how that happened, why it happened, and
14 rectify it.

16:19:02 15 THE COURT: All right. I'm going to grant the
16 motion to dismiss. This motion is at Docket 4007. I'm
17 granting it for the same reason that I granted the motion to
18 dismiss the Noterman, N-O-T-E-R-M-A-N, a complaint back in
19 May at Docket 1978.

16:19:20 20 And for purposes of talking it over, Mr. Lopez, this
21 is Doc 4007 that includes the motion and attachments.

22 All right. Those are all of the issues I wanted to
23 raise. Do plaintiffs counsel have other matters you'd like to
24 raise?

16:19:37 25 MR. LOPEZ: Not at this time, Your Honor.